89 No. 1825

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
MAY 22 1990
JOSEPH F. SPANIOL, JR.
CLERK

In The

Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1989

MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ,

Petitioner,

vs.

JUDGE RICHARD J. WOODS, *et al.*, ANTONIO R. SANCHEZ, SR., *et al.*, RICARDO DE ANDA, *et al.*, JUDGE MANUEL FLORES,

Respondents.

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ
Petitioner, Pro Se
1517 Garcia Street
Laredo, Texas 78040
(512) 723-6925

10597
Lutz Appellate Printers, Inc. • NJ (201) 257-6850 • (800) 3 APPEAL • NY (212) 840-4640 • MA (617) 542-1114 DC (202) 783-7288 • PA (215) 925-6500 • USA (800) 5 APPEAL

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

I. Whether the dismissal of the four appeals and the intimidation upon Petitioner Maria, by the United States Court of Appeals, Fifth Circuit, now stands as a judicial declaration that all state and federal judges within the jurisdiction of the Court of Appeals, Fifth Circuit can proceed with the power to defraud women of all their constitutional and protective rights.

II. Whether the state and federal courts, along with the United States Court of Appeals, Fifth Circuit, have the right to exist as anti-women-segreationist courts within the nation of liberties and freedoms equal for all.

III. Whether the United States Court of Appeals, Fifth Circuit, has the power to overthrow the democratic doctrines of the nation, by openly, with intimidations, moving to establish a state and federal judicial system of a double standard of justice — one for men and one for women.

IV. Whether the state and federal courts have the protective immunity powers to exist as racketeering courts of conspiracies, fraud, intimidations, terror, blackmail, and extortion.

V. Whether the United States Court of Appeals, Fifth Circuit erred in dismissing the four appeals before the court — in full knowledge that the lower courts had defrauded Petitioner of every right to a fair hearing had rendered final judgments based on one-sided hearings, and had denied to Petitioner the many pleadings for a change of venue out of the anti-women-segregationist courts.

VI. Whether the federal judges had the rights to impose their prejudice rules over the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, so as to defraud Petitioner of her rights to due process of law.

CERTIFICATE OF INTERESTED PERSONS

(1) The interest of the women of the United States of America, who have remained silent along the years as the courts defraud them of their rights.

(2) The interest of the women of the world, who believe that in the United States of America, liberties and freedoms are equal for all, but which do not exist for women.

(3) The interest of the people of the new liberated nations moving from communist to Democratic doctrines in the belief that oppression of rights will not exist.

(4) The interest of the United States Congress, who again moves to open up the issue of women's rights, and who should know that the main oppressors of rights upon women in the nation are the anti-women-segregationist courts of prejudice and discriminatory misfit judges.

(5) The interest of the women students of Communist China, who venerate the Lady of Liberty as the Goddess of Liberty with the symbol of liberties and freedoms equal for all, and which Goddess of Liberty equal rights has not existed for Petitioner Maria in any of the courts of the United States of America.

CITATIONS

It is that Petitioner Maria approaches the High Court with a case that has no precedent in the issue of the oppression of rights upon women by the courts of the nation.

It is that Petitioner's case before the High Court is directly related to the previous cases presented to the High Court by Petitioner Maria, and that move with the key issue of the oppression of rights upon Petitioner by the lower courts.

It is that the issue of the oppression of rights upon women by the courts of the nation has never been addressed by the Supreme Court of the United States and thus, Petitioner Maria bring such cases of extreme violations of rights and injustices by the lower courts imposed upon Petitioner Maria, so as to expose publicly the vicious abuse of rights upon women that has been perpetrated within all court levels in the United States of America, and covered-up by the judicial system thus far.

ORAL ARGUMENT BEFORE THE COURT

Petitioner Maria Graciela Ramirez, as *pro se*, will approach the Court in Oral Argument if the High Court permits that a woman *pro se* can approach the Court in Oral Argument.

Petitioner believes that Oral Argument before the Court in such an impressive issue as the segregation of rights upon women by the courts of the nation — would be part of the documented presentation before the Court.

LIST OF RESPONDENTS FROM THE APPEALS

Appeal No. 88-2976 — Judge Richard J. Woods, *et al.*

Judge Richard J. Woods
Atty. Julio A. Garcia
Dr. Homero R. Sanchez
Dr. Gregorio Pina III
Genaro Deleza
Edmundo Noe Rodriguez

Appeal No. 88-2977 — Antonio R. Sanchez Sr., *et al.*

Antonio R. Sanchez Sr.
Antonio R. Sanchez Jr.

Appeal No. 88-6145 — Ricardo De Anda, *et al.*

Atty. Ricardo De Anda
Atty. Teresa Hunter and Associates, Person, Whitworth, Ramos, Borchers, Morales
Atty. Lazaro Garza Gongora Jr.
Atty. Amador Gutierrez Jr.
Atty. Olivero E. Canales
Atty. Lowell F. Denton and Associates, Heard, Goggan, Blair, and Williams
Atty. W. O. Harrison

Appeal No. 89-6195 — Judge Manuel Flores
Judge Manuel Flores

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Questions Presented i

Certificate of Interested Persons ii

Citations iii

Oral Argument Before the Court iv

List of Respondents from the Appeals v

Table of Contents vi

Table of Citations vii

Opinions Below 2

Statement of Jurisdiction 3

Hearings Involved 3

Constitutional and Statutory Provisions Involved 10

Statement of Facts 13

Reasons for Granting the Writ 18

Conclusion 18

Contents

Page

TABLE OF CITATIONS

Case Cited:

Dred Scott Case (Dred Scott v. Sandford), 19 How. 393 (U.S. 1857) 16, 18, 19

United States Constitution Cited:

Second Amendment 11

Fourth Amendment 11

Fifth Amendment 11

Sixth Amendment 11, 12

Seventh Amendment 12

Eighth Amendment 12

Fourteenth Amendment 10

Statutes Cited:

18 U.S.C. § 241 12

18 U.S.C. § 242 13

APPENDIX

Appendix A — Opinion of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit 1a

Contents

Page

Appendix B — Final Judgment of the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas on *Ramirez v. Woods, et al.* 5a

Appendix C — Final Judgment of the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas on *Ramirez vs. Sanchez, et al.* 6a

Appendix D — Final Judgment of the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas on *Ramirez vs. Flores* *7a*

Appendix E — Final Judgment of the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas on *Ramirez v. Deanda, et al.* 9a

Appendix F — List of Judges that have Defrauded Petitioner of Her Rights to a Fair Hearing and an Impartial Court 10a

No.

In The

Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1989

MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ,

Petitioner,

vs.

JUDGE RICHARD J. WOODS, *et al.*, ANTONIO R. SANCHEZ, SR., *et al.*, RICARDO DE ANDA, *et al.*, and JUDGE MANUEL FLORES,

Respondents.

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

Before The Honorable Court:

Petitioner, Maria Graciela Ramirez as *pro se* before the Court, prays that a Writ of Certiorari be issued to review the judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, entered on March 5, 1990 within Appeal No. 89-2976, Appeal No. 89-2977, Appeal No. 89-6145, and Appeal No. 89-6195 (Appx. A, p. 1a).

It is that all the four appeals before the United States Court of Appeals Fifth Circuit, have one main issue in common — that of the oppression of rights upon Petitioner — where the dismissals in the lower courts were rendered in a one-sided hearings without any kind of a fair or impartial hearing for Petitioner — where all the pleadings, motions, and petitions were unjustly ignored by the lower courts — where Petitioner was denied a change of venue and forced to remain as a hostage within the anti-women-segregationist Federal Courts for the Southern District of Texas (Appx. B, C, D, E, pp. 5a-9a).

OPINIONS BELOW

The extremely bias and segregationist opinions of the United States Court of Appeals, Fifth Circuit, without any kind of a fair hearing for Petitioner, proceed to declare that — (1) "DISMISSED as frivolous within the intendment of Local Rule 42.2." (2) "Ramirez primarily uses her pleadings as a forum for accusing the Texas State court system and the Southern Federal District of Texas of being such things as anti-Hispanic, anti-women, segregationist, communist, and terrorist." (3) "Additionally, her complaints and subsequent pleadings are replete with conclusory allegations that the defendants, who alleged to be a part of that system, in some way violated her rights." (4) "Common to each of her claims is an entire lack of factual support." (5) These appeals, which cite neither facts nor case law, are wholly frivolous and do not warrant the further expenditure of judicial resources." (6)"Ramirez is warned of the consequences of filing further frivolous appeals, which will result in the imposition of sanctions pursuant to Rule 38, FRCP." (Appx. A, p. 4a).

STATEMENT OF JURISDICTION

28 U.S.C. § 1254:

> Cases in the courts of appeals may be reviewed by the Supreme Court . . . by writ of certiorari.

HEARINGS INVOLVED

It is that because the Writ of Certiorari before the High Court consists of four appeals within the certiorari, then Petitioner Maria presents a brief outline of the four appeals and their Respondents.

It is to be emphasized that the four appeals within the certiorari have the same key issue — that of the oppression of rights upon Petitioner by state and federal courts who refused to give to Petitioner a fair hearing within an impartial court because Petitioner is an Hispanic woman approaching the courts as *pro se*.

It is that the state and federal litigations involving Petitioner before the state and federal courts are directly or indirectly involved with the objective to defraud Petitioner of her ranchland and minerals while the courts defraud Petitioner of a fair hearing.

I. Appeal No. 88-2976 — Maria Graciela Ramirez, Plaintiff-Appellant — vs — Judge Richard J. Woods, *et al.*, Defendants-Appellee — identified as Judge Richard J. Woods, Atty. Julio A. Garcia, Dr. Homero R. Sanchez, Dr. Gregorio Pina III, Genaro Deleza, and Edmundo Noe Rodriguez Sr. (Appx. A, p. 1a; Appx. B, p. 5a)

A. Judge Richard J. Woods, as visiting judge in the 49th District Court for Webb County, Texas — within Cause No. 38,011 of July 1988 — totally, defrauding Petitioner Maria of her rights to a fair hearing and equal protection of the law (1)

by moving under double jeopardy proceedings, (2) "denying a change of venue many times (3) denying a jury hearing (4) "where Petitioner was under extreme inhuman intimidations by court and opposing counsel (5) where Judge Woods signed the final judgment, in conspiracy with the opposing counsel, by hearing the testimonies of only one side.

B. Attorney Julio A. Garcia, as District Attorney for Webb County, Texas — (1) was part of the conspiracy to defraud Petitioner of her property by using his legal position to defraud Petitioner of her rights (2) moved to defraud Petitioner of her privileges and rights to a fair hearing and to an impartial jury (3) moved to deny Petitioner the right to a change of venue (4) moved to overthrow the democratic doctrines by being instrumental in establishing a jury totally selected by the prosecution (5) moved to declare Petitioner guilty without proven guilty (6) was in full knowledge of a conspiracy to kidnap and murder Petitioner (7) was in full knowledge that Petitioner would be forced under inhuman duress to be a witness upon herself before the Grand Jury and before the one-sided selected jury (8) was in full knowledge that Petitioner would be terrorized and threatened into signing false confessions.

C. Dr. Homero R. Sanchez, a psychiatrist, and a relative by marriage to District Attorney Julio Garcia, was an accomplice in the conspiracy to defraud Petitioner of her property (1) by conspiring with DA Julio Garcia and presiding Judge Manuel Flores of the 49th District Court for Webb County, Texas, into declaring Petitioner as incompetent and of mental illness, so as to proceed to defraud Petitioner of her ranch and minerals by forever defrauding Petitioner of of her rights before the courts.

D. Dr. Gregorio Pina III, a psychologist, as a witness in Cause No. 38,011 at the 49 District Court for Webb County, Texas, in July 1988 — (1) moved to conspire with attorneys Lazaro

Garza Gongora Jr., Amador Gutierrez Jr., Teresa Hunter, and with Genaro Deleza and Edmundo Noe Rodriguez, and the presiding visiting judge Richard J. Woods (2) presented total perjury testimonies that defame Petitioner as a mentally ill person, as a wild and dangerous person (3) presented perjury testimonies about the sufferings of his client Genaro Deleza (4) was in full knowledge, by conspiracy, that Petitioner would be defrauded of a fair hearing and fair trial.

E. Genaro Deleza, a criminal trespasser into the ranchland of Petitioner (1) taking the ranch of Petitioner by force and aggression (2) by intimidation and approaching to kill Petitioner inside her ranch (3) by conspiring with the county sheriff to terrorize and torture Petitioner into silence (4) by conspiring with judges, officials, officers, and others to defraud Petitioner of her ranchland (5) by presenting total perjury testimonies before the Grand Jury and the perverted jury in Cause No. 20,730 (6) by presenting perjury testimonies in Cause No. 38,011, and 38,011-A (7) by being part of the conspiracy to kidnap and murder Petitioner (8) by being an accomplice with Antonio R. Sanchez Sr., and Antonio R. Sanchez Jr., in publishing false accusation upon Petitioner in the Sanchez owned newspaper, The Laredo News (9) publicly defaming the good name of Petitioner before the courts and within documentation.

F. Edmundo Noe Rodriguez Sr., a relative by marriage of Genaro DeLeza (1) a criminal trespasser into Petitioner's ranch by force and aggression (2) an accomplice to defraud Petitioner of her ranchland (3) presenting perjury testimonies before the courts and in documentation.

II. Appeal No. 88-2977 — Maria Graciela Ramirez, Plaintiff-Appellant — vs — Antonio R. Sanchez Sr., et al., Defendant-Appellee — identified as Antonio R. Sanchez Sr.,and Antonio R. Sanchez Jr. (Appx. A, p. 1a; Appx. C, p. 6a).

A. Antonio R. Sanchez Sr., and Antonio R. Sanchez Jr., are partners in Sanchez O'Brien Oil & Gas Corporation, and were in partnership with the publication of the Laredo News newspaper, until the shut-down of such newspaper. (1) Both Sanchez were, or are business friends with TransAmerican Natural Gas Corporation and Good Hope Energy Corporation who defrauded Petitioner of her ranch minerals (2) Both Sanchez moved as accomplice to defraud Petitioner of her property, by using their newspaper to falsely accuse and publicy defame Petitioner (3) Both Sanchez, in conspiracy with judges, officials, officers, and others were in full knowledge that Petitioner would be kidnapped and murdered (4) Both Sanchez, in conspiracy with officials, officers, and others were in full knowledge that Petitioner would be terrorized and tortured into signing false confessions (5) Both Sanchez are friends of the state and federal judges who defrauded Petitioner of all her rights before the courts (6) Both Sanchez were in full knowledge that Petitioner would be stigmatized as of mental illness, and would be sentenced as a criminal without a fair hearing.

III. Appeal No. 89-6145 — Maria Graciela Ramirez, Plaintiff-Appellant — vs — Ricardo De Anda, *et al.* — Defendant-Appellee identified as Atty. Ricardo De Anda, Atty. Teresa Hunter, Atty. Lazaro Garza Gongora Jr., Amador Gutierrez Jr., Olivero E. Canales, Attys. Person, Whitworth, Ramos, Borchers & Morales — Atty. Lowell F. Denton, Attys. Heard, Goggan, Blair, Williams, and Harrison (Appx. A, p. 2a; Appx. E, p. 9a).

A. Atty. Richardo De Anda, as attorney for United Independent School District (1) In conspiracy with the Texas Court, threatened Petitioner with court action into handing over extortion money (2) moved to put a lien on the ranch property of Petitioner so as to force Petitioner to hand over the blackmail and extortion money of mineral taxes not owed by Petitioner (3) involved in the conspiracy to defraud Petitioner of her ranch and mineral property.

B. Atty. Teresa Hunter, wife of Attorney Amador Gutierrez, moved in conspiracy with Genaro Deleza, Edmundo Noe Rodriguez Sr., Dr. Gregorio Pina III, Judge Richard J. Woods, Atty. Lazaro Garza Gongora Jr., Atty. Amador Gutierrez, and others, in Cause No. 38,011 at the 49th District Court for Webb County, Texas — (1) Conspiracy and plan to move before the court in a total perjury presentations of Genaro DeLeza, Dr. Gregorio Pina, and others (2) conspired with Judge Woods into denying to Petitioner a change of venue, a jury hearing, and a fair hearing (3) conspired with Dr. Pina to move in a long perjury presentation publicly degrading and defaming Petitioner before the court (4) attacked Petitioner before the court with irrelevant information about Petitioner's private property and business (5) harrassed the witnesses of Petitioner to be forced to be the witnesses for her clients, and distorted their testimonies (6) was instrumental in bringing about a final verdict based totally on the one-sided hearings of her clients.

C. Atty. Lazaro Garza Gongora Jr. and Atty. Amador Gutierrez (1) In conspiracy with Genaro Deleza, Edmundo Noe Rodriguez, Judge Manuel Flores, Judge Richard J. Woods, Atty. Teresa Hunter, and others, in moving to defraud Petitioner of her ranch property and minerals by using the courts in racketeering procedures of threats, intimidations, and oppression of rights (2) In conspiracy with Judge Manuel Flores, in moving with blackmail and extortion and severe intimidation upon Petitioner, so as to defraud Petitioner of her real property (3) In conspiracy with Genaro Deleza, Edmundo Noe Rodriguez, and Dr. Gregorio Pina to commit perjury before the court and in documentation (4) in conspiracy with Judge Richard Woods to devoid Petitioner of a fair hearing, of her right to a change of venue, and of her right to a jury hearing.

D. Atty. Olivero E. Canales and Atty. Lowell F. Denton were the attorneys for Webb County, Texas, in Civil Action of

Maria Graciela Ramirez — vs — Webb County, Texas, et al, at the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas, Houston Division in Civil Action No. H-88-3462, later transfered by force, to the Laredo Division as L-88-92. (1) Atty. Canales and Atty. Denton were instrumental in the cover-up of the terror and torture procedures upon Petitioner by the Webb County, Texas, sheriff and officers, and the cover-up of the threats and extortion upon Petitioner by the Webb County, Texas, tax office. (2) Attorney Canales and Denton moved to influence the federal judges into defrauding Petitioner of her right to a change of venue, and the right to a fair trial, thus the final judgment of L-88-92 decided by hearing only one side (3) instrumental that the Default Petition presented by Petitioner before the court, be ignored by the court.

E. Attorneys Heard, Goggan, Blair, Williams, and Harrison are associates of Atty. Lowell F. Denton.

F. Attorneys Person, Whitworth, Ramos, Borchers and Morales, are (or were) associates of Attorney Teresa Hunter.

IV. Appeal No. 89-6195 — Maria Graciela Ramirez, Plaintiff-Appellant — vs — Judge Manuel Flores, Defendant-Appellee (Appx. A, p. 2a; Appx. D, p. 7a).

A. Judge Manuel Flores of the 49th District Court for Webb County, Texas — has been one of the most vicious anti-women-segregationist judges to defraud Petitioner of all her rights before his court, and enlisting visiting judges to proceed with the oppression of rights upon Petitioner. Judge Flores has (1) conspired with District Attorney Julio Garcia, visiting Judge Richard J. Woods, Webb County, Texas Sheriff Mario Santos, Federal Judges of the Southern District of Texas as Judge George P. Kazen and Judge James DeAnda, and other state and federal judges and officials — to defraud Petitioner of her rights to a fair hearing, her rights to due process of law, her rights to equal

protection of the law, her very basic rights to the liberties and freedoms guaranteed equally for all (2) Judge Flores has been merciless in publicly intimidating Petitioner with jail and prison sentences, and with publicly stigmatizing Petitioner as of mental illness (3) has conspired with federal judge James DeAnda to publicly stigmatize Petitioner as of mental illness, and to devoid Petitioner of a fair hearing before all the courts in the United States District Courts for the Southern District of Texas (4) has conspired with Atty. Garza Gongora and others, to impose Petitioner with deep fear, blackmail and extortion so as to force Petitioner to hand over her property (5) has moved with bribery so that Petitioner give up her property to his friends (6) was in conspiracy with those that conspired to kidnap and murder Petitioner (7) was in conspiracy with the Sanchez' of the Laredo News, who used their newspaper to falsely accuse and condemn Petitioner (8) was in full knowledge that Petitioner would be terrorized and tortured into signing false confessions (9) was in conspiracy with the district attorney, federal officials, and others to overthrow the democratic doctrines and establish oppression of rights and a jury totally selected by the prosecution (10) was in conspiracy with the Texas Attorney General, Jim Mattox, to defraud Petitioner of the very basics of a fair hearing and fair trial, and hide behind "immunities" (11) Judge Flores, in conspiracy with officials and friends, moved to sentence Petitioner as a criminal, knowing that Petitioner had been inhumanly declared guilty without proven guilty by the sold-out one-sided selected jury (12) Judge Flores and the conspiracy in preconceived racketeering procedures used the courts and official positions to rob Petitioner of her ranch and minerals with false accusations, intimidations, abuse of rights, blackmail, extortion, and extreme and cruel punishments.

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

It is that Petitioner Maria, with factual manifested evidence, exposes before the nation, the most vicious and inhuman abuse of rights upon women by the state and federal courts and officials, reminiscent of the Ku Klux Klan state and federal courts that viciously defrauded the Negroid of their constitutional and protective rights, while the High Court and press remained silent.

United States Constitution, Amendment XIV:

> No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States, nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the law.

(1) It is that Petitioner Maria has been defrauded of the entire Fourteenth Amendment rights, section one, when — (a) the State of Texas by its Attorney General, moves to protect every perverted prejudiced judge and official who moves to rob a woman of her property and of her rights (b) when the State of Texas by its courts and officials moved to deprive Petitioner of her liberty and property without due process of law — (c) when the State of Texas by its judges and officials continually denied to Petitioner the equal protection of the law by forcing Petitioner to remain as hostage before the hostile anti-women-segregationist courts — and the Federal Courts for the Southern District of Texas, and the United States Court of Appeals, Fifth Circuit affirmed and participated in the oppression of rights upon Petitioner — thus, a double standard of justice is firmly established by state and federal courts to "legally" defraud a woman of her rights.

United States Constitution, Amendments II, IV, V, VI, VII, VIII:

Amendment II — "The right of the people to keep and bear arms . . ." (1) has been denied to Petitioner for her protection in her ranch and in her home.

Amendment IV — "The right of the people to be secured in their persons, houses . . ." (1) has been denied to Petitioner when viciously attacked in her ranch and in her home.

Amendment V — "Nor shall any person be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy . . . " (1) Petitioner was put in jeopardy more than twice. — "nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself . . . " (2) Petitioner was compelled, under extreme dures, to be a witness against herself before the Grand Jury, and before the one-sided selected jury. — "nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law . . . " (3) Petitioner was deprived of liberty and property without due process of law.

Amendment VI — "In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the state . . . " (1) Petitioner was unjustly prosecuted as a criminal for defending her life inside her ranch against a criminal attacker (2) Petitioner was forced to a long drawn-out trial of intimidations and threats by the prosecution and judge (3) Petitioner was forced, under inhuman

fear, to approach a totally prejudice controlled jury totally selected by the prosecution with preconceived conspiracies to bring about a guilty verdict and impose inhuman punishments upon Petitioner, so as to rob Petitioner of her ranch and mineral property.

Amendment VII — "In Suits at common law — the right of trial by jury shall be preserved — " (1) Petitioner in a civil case was continually denied a change of venue and a jury trial.

Amendment VIII — "Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted." — (1) Petitioner was forced to pay excessive bail, and excessive fines, under fear of bodily harm (2) Petitioner, along the years, has been imposed with the most cruel punishments by judges and officials, including "unusual" savage punishments by officers, of "cattle prods" to the head.

18 U.S.C. § 241

Conspiracy against rights of citizens — If two or more persons conspire to injure, oppress, threaten, or intimidate any citizen . . .

(1) Judges, officials, officers, and others moved under a conspiracy that Petitioner would be kidnapped from her home and murdered, and thus appear as a suicide — and the evidence appears to fortify such statement.

(2) Officers within the conspiracy, threatened Petitioner with bodily harm, until forced to sign the false confessions.

18 U.S.C. §242

> Deprivation of rights under color of law — Whoever under color of any law, statute . . .

(1) It is that state and federal judges, officials, and officers, under color of law, moved to defraud Petitioner of every security rights to the constitution and laws of the land.

STATEMENT OF THE FACTS

It is that the United States Appeals Court for the Fifth Circuit, moved viciously and with great injustices and total discrimination, to attack Appellant-Petitioner Maria for daring to approach the lower courts with complaints upon the violations of her rights, and further threatened Petitioner with severe punishments, if Petitioner should ever approach such court again (Appx. A, p. 4a).

I. It is that the U.S. Court of Appeals Fifth Circuit, in their bias and prejudiced dismissal declares that "DISMISSED as frivolous . . . "

A. It is that if Petitioner approaches the courts of the nation as *pro se* with a complaint upon the violation of her rights — the courts tag such woman as "frivolous" and is denied a fair hearing.

B. It is that in all of the documents that Petitioner Maria has submitted to state and federal courts, none can be identified or proven to be "frivolous" — just as the pleadings for liberty rights of the hostages within Lebanon cannot be tagged as "frivolous".

II. The Appeal Court, Fifth Circuit declares that — "Ramirez primarily uses her pleadings as a forum for accusing the Texas State court system and the Southern Federal District of Texas

of being such things as anti-Hispanic, anti-women, segregationist, communist, and terrorist" (Appx. A, p. 3a).

A. How is it that the Appeal Court, Fifth Circuit can openly assert that Petitioner "Ramirez uses her pleadings as a forum for accusing . . . " when the court of appeals, and the lower courts have never given Petitioner a fair hearing to present the facts on such "forum" accusations.

B. It is that Petitioner Maria does not need to use "her pleadings as a forum . . . ", when the doctrines of the nation has guaranteed to Petitioner Maria the *equal rights* to approach the courts of the nation, and the *equal rights* to a fair hearing, and which equal rights to justice have been inhumanly denied by the lower courts and by the United States Court of Appeals, Fifth Circuit.

C. It is that if Petitioner Maria "accused" the Texas courts and the Federal Courts for the Southern District of Texas as anti-Hispanic, anti-woman-segregationist, communist, and terrorist — it is because Petitioner Maria has the proofs in manifested evidence that such exists — but when the perverted and bias courts of the nation move to gag Petitioner Maria from her rights to a fair hearing, then the injustices and inhumanities are covered-up.

III. The Appeal Court, Fifth Circuit declares that " . . . her complaints and subsequent pleadings are replete with conclusory allegations . . . " (Appx. A, p. 3a).

A. How can the Appeal Court, Fifth Circuit, certify that the pleadings of Petitioner Maria are "replete with conclusory allegations", when the Appeal Court, the lower state and federal courts have all gagged Petitioner from presenting the proofs of the "allegations", within a fair hearing.

IV. The Appeal Court, Fifth Circuit declares that — "Common to each of her claims is an entire lack of factual support" (Appx. A, p. 3a).

A. How can Petitioner Maria present "factual support of her claims, when every state and federal court have closed every avenue to a fair and to an impartial hearing, for Petitioner.

B. It is that Petitioner Maria *has the facts* to every claim made, but when the state and federal courts, along with the United States Court of Appeals, Fifth Circuit, move in conspiracies to restrain Petitioner Maria from presenting the complaints with facts before an impartial court — then the courts openly disclose their true identity of anti-women-segregationist courts.

V. The Appeal Court, Fifth Circuit, within the Dismissal, unjustly accuses Petitioner Maria that — "Ramirez continues her diatribes against the court system while leaving a dearth of clues as to the cause of her sense of outrage and injustice" (Appx. A, p. 4a).

A. It is that when the state and federal courts of the nation move with great injustices and oppression of rights upon women as Petitioner Maria, and the "court system" of the nation is no different then the apartheid court systems of other segregationist nations — then Petitioner Maria will continue the "diatribes against the court system" where traitor judges have publicly disgrace and destroyed the doctrines of the nations.

B. It is that if it's nationally justified that the high officials of the nation, publicly move in "diatribes against the court system" of Communist China and Lebanon, with a "sense of outrage and injustices" — then surely it is justified that Petitioner Maria move in a "diatribes" with a "sense of outrage and injustices" upon the anti-women-segregationist courts of the nation, that have no

right to exist, and whose judges are misfits within Democratic Doctrines.

C. It is that Petitioner Maria has not left out any "dearth of clues as to the cause of her sense of outrage and injustices". Release Petitioner Maria from the savage hostage-grip of the Federal Courts for the Southern District of Texas, and extent to Petitioner Maria the freedom rights to approach a far-away court of impartial judges and of fair hearings, and an Appeal Court of impartiallity, and Petitioner Maria will present the "clues" with facts before public view.

VI. The Appeal Court, within the Dismissal, moves to declare that — "These appeals, which cite neither facts nor case law, are wholly frivolous and do not warrant the further expenditure of judicial resources" (Appx. A, p. 4a).

A. It is that the "judicial resources" are to be used *equally for the fair hearings of both men and women* before the courts, and when the segregationist courts of the nation defraud women of their rights with cover-up oppression procedures as "frivolous", along with intimidations, blackmail, and defraud of every right to approach the courts of the nation — then the "expenditure of judicial resources" can be greatly minimized by transfering the anti-women-segregationist judges to apartheid and oppression of rights nations where their procedures of injustices are wholly accepted.

B. It is that Petitioner Maria has not cited any "case law", because the appeals before the Appeal Court, Fifth Circuit, indicate a precedent case where the rights of women are oppressed by the courts, and the only similar case that can be cited is the Dred Scott Case where the courts of the nation viciously attacked and destroyed the Democratic Doctrines of the nation by defrauding the Negroid of their rights because of their race —

and now the courts of the nation again confront and attack the Democratic Doctrines of the nation by defrauding women of their rights because of sex identity.

VII. It is that the United States Court of Appeals, Fifth Circuit, has publicly threatened Petitioner Maria that — "Ramirez is warned of the consequences of filing further frivolous appeals, which will result in the imposition of sanctions pursuant to Rule 38, FRCP" (Appx. A, p. 4a).

A. It is that such intimidation declarations by the United States Court of Appeals, Fifth Circuit, to punish Petitioner for approaching such court in seeking redress to her rights — shall become as inhumanly memorable as the declaration of bondage upon the Negroid people by the United States Supreme Court in the Dred Scott case of March 1857, that rendered the courts of the nation as the major oppressors of rights.

VIII. It is that when the oppressors of rights upon women are the state and federal judges, and a woman before the courts as *pro se* is devoid of all her rights, then the Judicial System is in open defiance of justice.

A. It is that along the years, Petitioner has never had a fair hearing in any of the state and federal courts, has never met an impartial judge or an impartial jury, and has never seen justice in any of the courts that Petitioner has approached (Appx. F, p. 10a).

B. It is that when the United States Court of Appeals, Fifth Circuit, in the greatest injustice, moved to dismiss the four appeals, immediately Respondents Judge Manuel Flores, Atty., Lazaro Garza Gongora Jr., Atty., Amador Gutierrez Jr., and Genaro Deleza — moved to intimidate Petitioner into giving up her property, using the Texas court of Judge Manuel Flores for the

extortion procedures, only this time with the backing and protection of the United States Court of Appeals, Fifth Circuit, who had moved to protect every violator court with the dismissal of the four appeals.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

It is that the major reason for granting the writ, is that the Maria Cases before the United States Supreme Court, consists of the "precedent case" that exposes the severe violations of rights upon women by the state and federal courts, because of sex identity.

It is that the Maria Cases brings before the High Court, with facts and manifested evidence, the prevalent existence of the ant-women-segregationist courts within the United States of America, whose judges submit a woman before the court, to the most vicious abuse of rights.

It is that the anti-women-segregationist courts of the nation are no different then the anti-negroid courts that were perpetrated by state and federal courts and the High Court of the nation, until the Congress of the United States moved to end the inhuman injustices of the segregationist courts.

It is that if the United States Congress again has to move, like from the Dred Scott case, to eliminate the segregationist courts within the nation — then the High Court and the courts within the nation will permanently lose all credibility and respect before the nation and before the world.

CONCLUSION

It is that the dismissal of the four appeals, and the threats upon Petitioner by the United States Court of Appeals, Fifth

Circuit — now moves into a national issue of the violations of rights upon women by the courts because of sex identity — no different then the issue of the oppression of rights upon the Negroid people because of race identity, and manifested in the Dred Scott case.

It is that in the Dred Scott case decision by the High Court of March 6, 1857, the declaration by the High Court was that a Negro, because of race identity, was not entitled to the rights of a citizen and had no standing in the court — and in the decision of the United States Court of Appeals, Fifth Circuit of March 5, 1990, the court, in effect, declared that Petitioner Maria, because of sex identity is not entitled to the rights of a citizen and has no standing in the state and federal courts of the nation — and thus, the United States Court of Appeals, Fifth Circuit, has declared that state and federal judges proceed to destroy the 14th Amendment rights of "equal protection of the law", and proceed to deny to Petitioner Maria every right to justice.

It is that because Petitioner was denied the guaranteed rights to present her testimonies before an impartial court — then the United States of America has become liable with the responsibility to pay to Petitioner the relief damages sought in each of the four cases.

It is that the dismissal of the four appeals and the inhuman intimidation upon Petitioner by the United States Court of Appeals, Fifth Circuit — has become the most damaging and defiant attack upon the democratice doctrines of the nation since the Dred Scott inhuman decision of 133 years ago.

Whatever the decision of the Court — it is that the vicious and inhuman oppression of rights imposed upon Petitioner, will long live as the great injustices perpetrated by state and federal courts upon women, and cover-up from court to court.

It is that the averments within this brief, are backed by manifested evidence.

Respectfully submitted,



MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ
Petitioner, Pro Se

APPENDIX A — OPINION OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

NO. 89-2976

MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

V.

JUDGE RICHARD J. WOODS, ET AL.,

Defendants-Appellees.

NO. 89-2977

MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

V.

ANTONIO R. SANCHEZ, SR., ET AL.,

Defendants-Appellees.

Appendix A

NO. 89-6145

MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

V.

RICARDO DEANDA, ET AL.,

Defendants-Appellees.

NO. 89-6195

MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

V.

JUDGE MANUEL FLORES,

Defendants-Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of Texas
(CA-L-89-78, CA-L-89-88, CA-L-89-101 and CA-H-88-3981)

(March 5, 1990)

Before GEE, DAVIS, and JONES, Circuit Judges.

Appendix A

PER CURIAM.*

The above appeals are, on the Court's own motion, consolidated and DISMISSED as frivolous within the intendment of Local Rule 42.2.

In these four actions, Appellant Maria Graciela Ramirez sued state and federal judges, prosecutors, trial witnesses, psychiatrists, private attorneys, and various private citizens for conspiracy to deprive her of her civil rights. Ramirez primarily uses her pleadings as a forum for accusing the Texas State court system and the Southern Federal District of Texas of being such things as anti-Hispanic, anti-women, segregationist, communist, and terrorist. Additionally, her complaints and subsequent pleadings are replete with conclusory allegations that the defendants, who are alleged to be a part of that system, in some way violated her rights. Common to each of her claims is an entire lack of factual support.

In three of the four cases, Nos. 89-2976, 89-2977, and 89-6145, the district court found the allegations to be wholly conclusory and granted Ramirez an opportunity to amend her complaint to state facts supporting her allegations. Ramirez expressly refused to do so, continuing instead her name-calling tirades. Because she refused to explain how any of her rights were violated, much less how any of the named defendants should be held liable for such violations, the district court had no choice but to dismiss these claims under Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6). *See* Brinkmann v. Johnson, 793 F.2d 111, 113 (5th Cir. 1986).

---

* Local Rule 47.5 provides: "The publication of opinions that have no precedential value and merely decide particular cases on the basis of well-settled principles of law imposes needless expense on the public and burdens on the legal profession." Pursuant to that Rule, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published.

Appendix A

In the fourth case, No. 89-6195, Ramirez sought damages against a state court judge, who presumably presided over a criminal trial in which Ramirez was defendant. The district court properly dismissed the claim on grounds of immunity, and no opportunity to amend was required because it is clear that Ramirez could not have stated a claim in an amended complaint. *See* Jacquez v. Procunier, 801 F.2d 789, 792-93 (5th Cir. 1986).

Before us, Ramirez continues her diatribes against the court system while leaving a dearth of clues as to the cause of her sense of outrage and injustice. This sense is patently severe and genuine; but we can be of no assistance to her — she having chosen to maintain its factual basis as a mystery. These appeals, which cite neither facts nor case law, are wholly frivolous and do not warrant the further expenditure of judicial resources.

In addition, we note that Ramirez has previously presented at least one other frivolous appeal to our Court. Ramirez v. United States, No. 89-2246 (5th Cir. July 14, 1988) (unpublished). That case is nearly identical in nature to the instant cases. Ramirez is warned of the consequences of filing further frivolous appeals, which will result in the imposition of sanctions pursuant to Rule 38, FRAP.

DISMISSED.

APPENDIX B — FINAL JUDGMENT OF THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS ON *RAMIREZ V. WOODS, ET AL.*

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
LOREDO DIVISION

CIVIL ACTION NO. L-89-78

MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ,

Plaintiff,

VS.

JUDGE RICHARD J. WOODS, ET AL.,

Defendants.

JUDGMENT

It is ORDERED that this case be and it is now DISMISSED against all Defendants for failure to state a cause of action. Costs are taxed to Plaintiff.

DONE at Laredo, Texas, this 11th day of September, 1989.

s/ George P. Kazen
United States District Judge

ENTERED SEP 11 1989
Jesse E. Clark, Clerk
By Deputy:
K. Pena

APPENDIX C — FINAL JUDGMENT OF THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS ON *RAMIREZ VS. SANCHEZ, ET AL.*

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
LAREDO DIVISION

CIVIL ACTION NO. L-89-88

MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ,

Plaintiff,

VS.

ANTONIO R. SANCHEZ, SR.,
ANTONIO R. SANCHEZ, JR.,

Defendants.

JUDGMENT

This case is DISMISSED for failure to state a claim against either Defendant. Costs are taxed to Plaintiff. The Court shall retain jurisdiction of this case for the purpose of imposing Rule 11 sanctions on the Plaintiff.

DONE at Laredo, Texas, this 11th day of September, 1989.

s/ George P. Kazen
United States District Judge

ENTERED SEP 11 1989
Jesse E. Clark, Clerk
By Deputy:
K. Pena

APPENDIX D — FINAL JUDGMENT OF THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS ON *RAMIREZ VS. FLORES*

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
HOUSTON DIVISION

CIVIL ACTION NO. H-88-3981

MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ,

Plaintiff,

v.

JUDGE MANUEL FLORES, 49th District Court for Webb County, Texas,

Defendant.

FINAL JUDGMENT

As the Motion to Dismiss on Behalf of Defendant State District Judge Manuel Flores (Document #3) has been granted, this Court

DISMISSES this cause of action pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6).

This is a FINAL JUDGMENT.

SIGNED at Houston, Texas, on this the 18 day of October, 1989.

Appendix D

s/ David Hittner
DAVID HITTNER
United States District Judge

ENTERED OCT 20 1989
Jesse E. Clark, Clerk
By Deputy B. Rumada (?)

APPENDIX E — FINAL JUDGMENT OF THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS ON *RAMIREZ VS. DEANDA, ET AL.*

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTH DISTRICT OF TEXAS
LAREDO DIVISION

CIVIL ACTION NO. L-89-101

MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ,

Plaintiff,

VS.

ATTORNEY RICARDO DE ANDA, ET AL.,

Defendants.

JUDGMENT

It is ORDERED that Plaintiff take nothing from any of the Defendants in this cause. Costs are taxed to the Plaintiff.

DONE at Laredo, Texas, this 23rd day of October, 1989.

s/ George P. Kazen
United States District Judge

ENTERED: OCT 24 1989
Jesse E. Clerk, Clerk
By Deputy: K. Pena

APPENDIX F — LIST OF JUDGES THAT HAVE DEFRAUDED PETITIONER OF HER RIGHTS TO A FAIR HEARING AND AN IMPARTIAL COURT

Federal Courts:

United States District Courts, Southern District of Texas

Judge George P. Kazen, Laredo Division
Judge Lynn N. Hughes, Houston Division
Judge David Hittner, Houston Division
Judge Sim Lake, Houston Division
Judge Kenneth M. Hoyt, Houston Division
Judge Manuel Leal (Bankruptcy), Houston Division
Chief Judge James DeAnda, Houston Division

United States Court of Appeals, Fifth Circuit

Circuit Judges Clark, Williams, Davis, Reavley, King, Jones, and Gee

United States Court of Appeals, Federal Circuit

Circuit Judges Mayer, Baldwin, Mills

United States Claims Court

Judge James T. Turner

United States Supreme Court

Justices: Unidentified in the denials

Appendix F

Texas Courts:

Texas District Courts

Judge Antonio Zardenetta, Laredo
Judge Manuel Flores, Laredo
Judge Elma Salinas Ender, Laredo
Judge Ruben Garcia, Laredo (ex-judge)
Judge Richard Woods (visiting judge)

Texas Court of Appeals, Fourth District

Chief Justice Carlos C. Cadena
Justice Shirley W. Butts
Justice Alfonso Chapa
Justice Rudy S. Esquivel

Texas Supreme Court

Justices: Unidentified in the denials